examination or purchase as stated above.

The large number of SIAPs, their complex nature, and the need for a special format make their verbatim publication in the **Federal Register** expensive and impractical. Further, airmen do not use the regulatory text of the SIAPs, but refer to their graphic depiction on charts printed by publishers of aeronautical materials. Thus, the advantages of incorporation by reference are realized and publication of the complete description of each SIAP contained in FAA form documents is unnecessary. The provisions of this amendment state the affected CFR (and FAR) sections, with the types and effective dates of the SIAPs. This amendment also identifies the airport, its location, the procedure identification and the amendment number.

The Rule

This amendment to part 97 is effective upon publication of each separate SIAP as contained in the transmittal. Some SIAP amendments may have been previously issued by the FAA in a National Flight Data Center (FDC) Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) as an emergency action of immediate flight safety relating directly to published aeronautical charts. The circumstances which created the need for some SIAP amendments may require making them effective in less than 30 days. For the remaining SIAPs, an effective date at least 30 days after publication is provided.

Further, the SIAPs contained in this amendment are based on the criteria contained in the U.S. Standard for Terminal Instrument Approach Procedures (TERPS). In developing these SIAPs, the TERPS criteria were applied to the conditions existing or anticipated at the affected airports. Because of the close and immediate relationship between these SIAPs and safety in air commerce, I find that notice and public procedure before adopting these SIAPs are unnecessary, impracticable, and contrary to the public interest and, where applicable, that good cause exists for making some SIAPs effective in less than 30 days.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore—(1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3)

does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. For the same reason, the FAA certifies that this amendment will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 97

Air traffic control, Airports, Navigation (air).

Issued in Washington, DC on December 30, 1994.

Thomas C. Accardi,

Director, Flight Standards Services.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 97) is amended by establishing, amending, suspending, or revoking Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, effective at 0901 UTC on the dates specified, as follows:

PART 97—STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURES

1. The authority citation for part 97 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. app. 1348, 1354(a), 1421 and 1510; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.49(b)(2).

2. Part 97 is amended to read as follows:

§§ 97.23, 97.25, 97.27, 97.29, 97.31, 97.33, and 97.35 [Amended]

By amending: § 97.23 VOR, VOR/DME, VOR or TACAN, and VOR/DME or TACAN; § 97.25 LOC, LOC/DME, LDA, LDA/DME, SDF, SDF/DME; § 97.27 NDB, NDB/DME; § 97.29 ILS, ILS/DME, ISMLS, MLS, MLS/DME, MLS/RNAV; § 97.31 RADAR SIAPs; § 97.33 RNAV SIAPs; and § 97.35 COPTER SIAPs, identified as follows:

* * * Effective March 30, 1995

Fairbanks, AK, Fairbanks Intl, VOR OR TACAN RWY 19R, Orig Westerly, RI, Westerly State, GPS RWY 7, Orig

* * * Effective March 2, 1995

Eagle Grove, IA, Eagle Grove Municipal, NDB OR GPS RWY 31, Amdt 1, Cancelled Ruston, LA, Ruston Muni, VOR/DME–A, Amdt 11

Ruston, LA, Ruston Muni, NDB RWY 34, Amdt 2

Chesapeake, VA, Chesapeake Muni, NDB RWY 5, Orig

* * * Effective February 2, 1995

Cold Bay, AK, Cold Bay, ILS RWY 14, Amdt 15

Kodiak, AK, Kodiak, VOR OR TACAN OR GPS-1, RWY 25, Amdt 5 Kodiak, AK, Kodiak, NDB-1, RWY 25, Amdt 3

West Memphis, AR, West Memphis Muni, ILS RWY 17, Amdt 2

Howell, MI, Livingston County, VOR OR GPS RWY 31, Amdt 10

Howell, MI, Livingston County, NDB OR GPS RWY 13, Amdt 1

Monticello, MO, Lewis County Regional, VOR/DME–A, Orig

Monroe, NC, Monroe, LOC RWY 5, Amdt 2, Cancelled

Monroe, NC, Monroe, ILS RWY 5, Orig

* * * Effective January 5, 1995

Fort Leavenworth, KS, Sherman AAF, RNAV RWY 15, Amdt 1, Cancelled

* * * Effective Upon Publication

Victoria, TX, Victoria Regional, VOR OR GPS RWY 12L, Amdt 14

Victoria, TX, Victoria Regional, NDB RWY 12L, Amdt 4

Chesapeake, VA, Chesapeake Muni, LOC RWY 5, Amdt 1

[FR Doc. 95–2564 Filed 2–1–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Secretary

24 CFR Part 907

[Docket No. R-95-1704; FR-3573-C-03] RIN 2577-AB38

Homeownership Demonstration Program in Omaha, Nebraska; Technical Correction

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, HUD. **ACTION:** Final rule; technical correction.

SUMMARY: On January 20, 1995, HUD published a final rule implementing a demonstration program that permits the homeownership sale of single family homes administered by the Housing Authority of the City of Omaha, Nebraska (60 FR 4344). This document corrects § 907.8(d) of that final rule, to include certain amendatory language that was inadvertently omitted.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of this correction is February 2, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gary Van Buskirk, Homeownership Division, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW., Room 4112, Washington, DC 20410. Telephone number, voice (202) 708–4233, TDD (202) 708–0850. (These are not toll-free numbers.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 20, 1995 (60 FR 4344), HUD published a final rule implementing section 132 of the Housing and

Community Development Act of 1992 (Pub. L. 102–550, approved Oct. 28, 1992). Section 132 establishes a demonstration program to facilitate self-sufficiency and to permit the homeownership sale of single family homes administered by the Housing Authority of the City of Omaha in the State of Nebraska. The purpose of the demonstration is to exhibit the effectiveness of promoting homeownership and providing support services.

This document corrects § 907.8(d) of that final rule, to include certain amendatory language that was described in the preamble to the final rule, but inadvertently omitted from the rule text. On page 4345 of the final rule (60 FR 4345), in paragraph II.2., in the second column, the preamble states: 'Additionally, in response to the Housing Authority's comment above, the final rule includes as eligible homebuyers both current residents and applicants for public housing. Since HUD has changed the rule in this manner, the Housing Authority must comply with §§ 907.7(b), 907.8(d), and 907.20(n)." However, while the preamble indicated that § 907.8(d) would be amended to recognize that applicants for public housing could also be eligible homebuyers, this amendment was inadvertently omitted from the rule

Accordingly, FR Doc. 95–1414, a final rule published in the **Federal Register** on January 20, 1995 (60 FR 4344) is corrected to read as follows:

1. Section 907.8 is corrected by revising the second sentence in paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 907.8 Purchaser eligibility and selection.

(d) Procedures/Affirmative Fair
Housing Marketing Strategy. * * * The
Housing Authority must have an
affirmative fair housing marketing
strategy that applies to all transactions
undertaken through this program and
that stresses equal access to the program
for both current residents and
applicants for public housing. * * *

Dated: January 27, 1995.

Michael B. Janis,

General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing.

[FR Doc. 95-2560 Filed 2-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-32-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

30 CFR Part 914

[IN-118, Amendment Number 94-4]

Indiana Regulatory Program

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), Interior.

ACTION: Final rule; approval of amendment.

SUMMARY: OSM is approving a proposed amendment to the Indiana permanent regulatory program (hereinafter referred to as the Indiana program) under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA). The amendment consists of miscellaneous revisions to Indiana's Surface Coal Mining and Reclamation Rules. The amendment is intended to revise the Indiana program to eliminate typographical, clerical, and spelling errors and to amend those instances where the word "commission" should be changed to "director" in accordance with Indiana Senate Enrolled Act (SEA)

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 2, 1994.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Roger W. Calhoun, Director, Indianapolis Field Office, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Minton-Capehart Federal Building, 575 North Pennsylvania Street, Room 301, Indianapolis, IN 46204, Telephone (317) 226–6166.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on the Indiana Program.
II. Submission of the Amendment.
III. Director's Findings.
IV. Summary and Disposition of Comments.
V. Director's Decision.
VI. Procedural Determinations.

I. Background on the Indiana Program

On July 29, 1982, the Indiana program was made effective by the conditional approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Information pertinent to the general background on the Indiana program, including the Secretary's findings, the disposition of comments, and a detailed explanation of the conditions of approval of the Indiana program can be found in the July 26, 1982 **Federal Register** (47 FR 32107). Subsequent actions concerning the conditions of approval and program amendments are identified at 30 CFR 914.10, 914.15, and 914.16.

II. Submission of the Amendment

By letter dated September 26, 1994 (Administrative Record No. IND-1400), Indiana submitted program amendment No. 94–4 concerning miscellaneous revisions to the Indiana rules to eliminate typographical, clerical, and spelling errors and to amend those instances where the word "commission" should be changed to "director" in accordance with Indiana SEA 362. OSM approved SEA 362 as a program amendment on August 2, 1991 (56 FR 37016).

OSM announced receipt of the proposed amendment in the October 20, 1994, **Federal Register** (59 FR 52941), and, in the same notice, opened the public comment period and provided opportunity for a public hearing on the adequacy of the proposed amendment. The comment period closed on November 21, 1994.

III. Director's Findings

Set forth below, pursuant to SMCRA and the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 732.15 and 732.17, are the Director's findings concerning the proposed amendment to the Indiana program.

In amendment No. 94–4, Indiana corrected numerous typographical, clerical, or spelling errors and made numerous changes from the word "commission" to "director." The Director finds that the numerous typographical, clerical, and spelling changes are nonsubstantive changes or changes which improve the clarity or accuracy of the Indiana rules.

The Director finds that the changes from "commission" to "director" more accurately reflect the responsibilities within the Indiana program as provided by SEA 362 which was approved by OSM on August 2, 1991 (56 FR 37016), and that the changes do not render the Indiana program less effective than Federal regulations.

IV. Summary and Disposition of Comments

Federal Agency Comments

Pursuant to section 503(b) of SMCRA and 30 CFR 732.17(h)(11)(i), comments were solicited from various interested Federal agencies. No comments were received.

Public Comments

A public comment period and opportunity to request a public hearing was announced in the October 20, 1994, **Federal Register** (59 FR 52941). The comment period closed on November 21, 1994. No one commented and no one requested an opportunity to testify